Motion for Summary Judgment (42 Doc. #62<sup>2</sup>) filed on August 19, 2011. No objection to the Magistrate 1 Judge's Report and Recommendation has been filed. The action was referred to the Magistrate Judge 2 3 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)B and Local Rule 1B 1-4 of the Rules of Practice of the United States 4 District Court for the District of Nevada. 5 The Court has conducted its *de novo* review in this case, has fully considered the pleadings and 6 memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (B) and 7 Local Rule IB 3-2. The Court determines that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation entered 8 on July 17, 2012, should be adopted and accepted. 9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#86 in case no. 3:09-cv-0042-LRH-WGC; #106 in case no. 3:09-cv-0109-LRH-WGC; and #44 in case no. 3:09-10 11 cv-0110 entered on July 17, 2012, is adopted and accepted as follows: 12 In 3:09-cv-00109, Doe defendants are DISMISSED without prejudice; 13 In 3:09-cv-00109, summary judgment is GRANTED in favor of defendant Hindelang as to Count 14 7; 15 In 3:09-cv-00109, Counts 8 and 12 are DISMISSED without prejudice as the allegations 16 contained therein are only directed toward Doe defendants; 17 In 3:09-cv-00109, summary judgment is GRANTED as to defendant Ramsey in Counts 13 and 18 14; and In 3:09-cv-00110, summary judgment is GRANTED as to defendant Ramsey in Count 5. 19 Aldrihe 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 DATED this 10th day of September, 2012. 22 LARRY R. HICKS 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 24

26

25

The motion for summary judgment was filed in case 3:09-cv-00042.

<sup>2</sup>On April 22, 2011, Case Nos. 3:09-cv-00042, 3:09-cv-109 and 3-09-cv-110 were consolidated.